

Comment Set C.165: Robert and Laurie Glaser

From: Lazyriver9@aol.com [mailto:Lazyriver9@aol.com]
Sent: Tue 10/3/2006 9:31 AM
To: jmh@cpuc.ca.gov; Antelope-Pardee Project
Cc: jnoiron@fs.fed.us; jbx@cpuc.ca.gov
Subject: Comments Regarding Antelope-Pardee Leona Valley Power Lines

As a Registered Environmental Assessor for the State of California (REA# 4443), and a resident of Leona Valley, I have concerns regarding the proposed SCE power lines which are to run through Leona Valley (Antelope-Pardee). The proposed Alternative Route 5 is unacceptable. The reasons why I am against Alternative Route 5 are as follows:

1. The Alternative Route 5 would divide Leona Valley with a wide corridor where none currently exist. Leona Valley is currently a cohesive, friendly community, where neighbors look out for each other. The proposed Route 5 would divide the community. | C.165-1
2. The visual impact from the Alternative Route 5 would destroy the beauty of Leona Valley. Leona Valley is a place where the residents moved here for the comfort and feel of a rural neighborhood. Route 5 would have a devastating visual impact for all who live here and call Leona Valley home. | C.165-2
3. The Electro-Magnetic-Field (EMF) Radiation is of special concern to those who would live within 1/4-mile of the proposed Route 5 power lines. Studies have shown a possible link between EMF Radiation and an increased risk of Leukemia, Lou Gehrig's Disease, Brain Cancer, etc. A significant percentage of our residents live within 1/4-mile of the proposed Route 5. Even those who don't live adjacent to the proposed corridor may be affected, especially those who would have recreational activities on a regular basis in their vicinity, such as going for walks or horseback riding. | C.165-3
4. Noise Pollution is a legitimate concern to the residents of Leona Valley. Leona Valley is a very quiet, tranquil community. Noise from the proposed Route 5 power lines would be crackling all day and all night, particularly when there is any moisture in the air. This would be unacceptable, for those who would live within 1/4-mile or so, or for everybody who would just be taking a walk or go horseback riding. | C.165-4
5. The proposed Route 5 is inefficient. It would add several miles to the proposed transmission lines, resulting in a net loss of transmitted power. | C.165-5

The above are just some of the concerns that we have for the proposed Route 5. My wife is a Licensed Vocational Nurse and a co-signer of this letter. My friends and neighbors which I have contacted unanimously feel the same way about this proposed route.

I would appreciate a response to this letter.
Thank you,

Robert Glaser, REA 04443
Laurie Glaser, LVN
8753 Elizabeth Lake Road
Leona Valley, CA 93551

Response to Comment Set C.165: Robert and Laurie Glaser

- C.165-1 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.9.10.2, Alternative 5 would not conflict with the applicable land use plans for the area. Therefore, the route would not divide established communities per the County and local land use plans.
- C.165-2 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.15.10.2, the change to existing views as a result of infrastructure construction are considered a significant and unavoidable impact of Alternative.5. Your concerns will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.
- C.165-3 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding potential EMF impacts.
- C.165-4 As discussed in Section C.10.10.2, corona noise would result in identical less than significant noise impacts for Alternative 5 as the proposed Project.
- C.165-5 The additional length in Alternative 5 transmission line would not reduce the amount of electricity transferred, as the source of power would not be impacted and, therefore, no less electrical power would be generated.